



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

FEE

OFFICE OF CHEMICAL SAFETY
AND POLLUTION PREVENTION

OFFICE OF PESTICIDE PROGRAMS
REGISTRATION DIVISION (7505P)

DP BAR CODE NO.: 390846
PC Code(s): 128825,129064
FOOD Use: Yes

FILE SYMBOL NO.: 239-ETRT DECISION NO.: 449846
ACTION CODE: R310
NON-FOOD Use: Yes

DATE OUT: December 8, 2011

SUBJECT: End Use Product Chemistry Review
Product Name: Ortho Home Defense Indoor and Outdoor Insect Killer

FROM: Hari Mukhoty
Product Chemistry Team
Technical Review Branch / Registration Division (7505P)

TO: BeWanda Alexander / Richard Gebken PM - 10
Insecticide Branch / Registration Division (7505P)

Handwritten signature and date: 12/8/11

Company Name: The Scotts Company.
Formulation Type: Liquid

INTRODUCTION:

The Registrant has submitted one basic CSF (dated: 05/10/2011), one amended CSF (dated: 05/10/2011) as alternate formulation to the aforesaid basic (Alt. A) and has proposed a product specific label for registration of the aforesaid products under EPA File Symbol No. 239-ETRT. The registrant submitted product chemistry Group A data from another product EPA Reg. No. 239-NEW under MRID(s): 484953-01. to support the registration of the proposed products.

The registrant claims that the proposed basic product is identical to the currently registered product EPA Reg. No. 279-9534.

TRB has been requested to evaluate the product chemistry data required for the registration of the proposed products.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

1. Name of Active Ingredient(s): Bifenthrin (0.0500%) and Zeta-Cypermethrin (0.0125%).
2. Has the registrant claimed substantial similarity to registered product?
[X] Yes [] No [] NA If yes: EPA Reg. No. 279-9534 (Claimed Identical, registrant's letter dated 05/25/2011).
3. The source material(s) of the active ingredient(s) is/are registered with the Agency.
4. All inert ingredients have been screened by IIAB on 06/02/2011 and have been found to be approved for food uses (Pre-Harvest application to growing crops).
5. The CSFs of the proposed basic and alternate formulation has been filled out completely and correctly.

DP BAR CODE NO.: 390846
PC Code(s): 128825,129064
FOOD Use: Yes

FILE SYMBOL NO.: 239-ETRT DECISION NO.: 449846
ACTION CODE: R310
NON-FOOD Use: Yes

6. Confidential Statement of Formula(s):

☒ Basic - Dated: 05/10/2011 re-submitted – Dated: NA

☐ Alternates- A Dated: 05/10/2011 re-submitted: Dated: NA

Alternate CSF(s) complies with 40CFR §152.43: ☒ Yes ☐ No NA ☐.

7. Product label

a. Ingredient statement: Nominal concentration of AI listed on CSF(s) concur with product label (PR Notice 91-2)

☒ Yes

Is the sub statement in compliance with PR Notice 97-6?

☒ Yes ☐ No - Uses the term "Other Ingredients"
, if not, explain below:

Metallic equivalent: ☐ Yes ☒ NA

Soluble arsenic: ☐ Yes ☒ NA

Isomeric ratios: ☒ Yes ☐ NA Cis isomers 97% min, trans isomers 3% max, Cis/trans
ratio = 75% max / 25% min

Acid equivalent: ☐ Yes ☒ NA

b. Health related sub statements:

Petroleum distillate at > 10%: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA

Methanol at > 4%: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA

Sodium Nitrate / Sodium Nitrite ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA

c. Physical chemical hazard statement: Product label requires a statement per 40 CFR §156.78 for:
flammability, explosive potential or electric insulator breakdown?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Total Release Fogger PR Notice 98-6 (40 CFR 156.78 d): ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA

d. Label requires an additional Storage and Disposal statement: ☐ Yes ☒ No – from product chemistry
point of view; if yes explain below:

Final decision of overall label acceptance will be made by the PM.

DP BAR CODE NO.: 390846
PC Code(s): 128825,129064
FOOD Use: Yes

FILE SYMBOL NO.: 239-ETRT **DECISION NO.: 449846**
ACTION CODE: R310
NON-FOOD Use: Yes

8. The registrant did not submit product specific data and relied on the cited product data because they claimed that the proposed product is identical to the cited product. A comparison of the CSF of the proposed product (dated:05/10/2011) with that of the cited product (dated: 09/23/2011) clearly indicates that these two CSFs are not identical. The inert ingredients used are quite different between these two products

CONCLUSIONS:

1. TRB has reviewed the CSFs for the submitted proposed basic (dated: 05/10/2011) and alternate formulation (Alt. A dated 05/10/2011) and has found them to be unacceptable because these are not identical products. The Alt A formulation cannot be accepted because the proposed basic CSF is not acceptable. The CSFs are attached with this review and can be located in OPPIN CHEM DOCS.

2. Product specific Product chemistry Group A and Group B data shall be required for registration of the proposed basic product.